

high deductible catastrophic insurance coverage is not the solution to our nation's health system problems because:

MSAs do not address the need for insurance by millions of working Americans whose employers will not contribute to the cost of health insurance; and

MSAs do not address the need for insurance by millions of low-income individuals who are self-employed or unemployed and who cannot afford to buy health insurance.

THE ADVANCED MEDICAL DEVICE ASSURANCE ACT OF 1995

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the Advanced Medical Device Assurance Act of 1995 in order to clarify the scope of coverage and amount of payment under the Medicare Program of items and services associated with the use of certain medical devices approved for investigational use.

Questions have been raised as to whether Medicare should reimburse for hospital and physician services when procedures involving a medical device approved for use by the Federal Drug Administration [FDA] under the Investigational Drug Device [IDE] is used. Our Nation's leading clinical researchers and doctors, and the patients who depend on these improved medical technologies are losing because of this confusion. Additionally, the use of these advanced devices is dramatically declining around the country. Many of the medical technology companies are moving all of their research out of the United States to Europe, Canada, and Japan where payment policy is not an issue.

These advanced medical devices reduce length of surgical procedure, hospitalization, patient mortality, and the need for repeat procedures. All of these patients, whether they get an advanced device or not, would be in the hospital anyway receiving medically indicated care. Clarifying the policy to provide coverage for newer devices would not increase costs because the DRG pays a set rate for set therapies regardless of whether there is a clinical trial involved.

The American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, American College of Cardiology, American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, Association of Professors of Medicine, California Health Institute, Catholic Health Association, Cleveland Clinic, Coalition of Boston Teaching Hospitals, Federation of American Health Systems, Greater New York Hospital Association, Health Industry Manufacturers Association, Mayo Clinic, North American Society of Pacing and Electrophysiology, and the Society of Thoracic Surgeons all believe we need to clarify this policy. These are all well-respected health care organizations and I believe this bill brings about the clarity that is needed.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to co-sponsor this important, cost-neutral legislation and to work for its prompt enactment so that Medicare beneficiaries will have access to safe and high-quality medical care.

STATEMENT IN RECOGNITION OF 2D LT. REBECCA E. MARIER

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker I rise to acknowledge and salute the outstanding achievements of 2d Lt. Rebecca E. Marier. This impressive young woman recently graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, NY at the top of her class—top of her class academically, physically, and militarily.

Second Lieutenant Marier opted to forgo an education at prestigious Harvard University, in order to pursue her dream of a degree from an institution which has a proud tradition of molding our Nation's leaders. Marier is unquestionably a role model for all of our Nation's young people, men and women alike.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and all my colleagues join me in not only commending Second Lieutenant Marier's achievements, but more importantly her spirit of selfless dedication to the service of our country. I would also ask, Mr. Speaker, that the New York Times's article which appeared this past Sunday, noting Second Lieutenant Marier's achievements, be inserted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1995]

WOMAN IS NO. 1 IN WEST POINT CLASS

WEST POINT, NY—For the first time in the United States Military Academy's 193-year old history, a woman took the No. 1 class rank as the Academy graduated 988 new members of the Army officer corps today.

The woman, Second Lieut. Rebecca E. Marier, 21, of New Orleans, was the head of her class in the school's three programs—military, academic and physical.

"It was the greatest feeling in the world, throwing up that white hat," Lieutenant Marier said after the ceremony. "I'm just glad to be part of the progress women are making all over the country."

Four years ago, she startled her family and friends by choosing the Academy over Harvard University for her undergraduate work because she wanted the "all-around challenge" and leadership training West Point offered.

But she plans to get to Harvard, after all, becoming the second cadet in West Point history to go on to medical school there, said Andrea Hamburger, an Academy spokeswoman.

Women began attending West Point in 1976, and with today's class, more than 1,400 women will have been commissioned second lieutenants.

At the ceremonies, the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Gordon Sullivan, addressed graduates, telling them that in an age of changing circumstances, there was no way to predict where they might serve.

General Sullivan omitted remarks about a possible United States role in Bosnia, which had appeared in an advance version of his address received by reporters.

In the prepared text, General Sullivan reviewed the American role as a member of NATO and said the United States was "prepared to act with NATO should the need arise."

Pressed afterward for an explanation of the omission in his speech, he replied: "I felt I had made the point of the uncertainty of the world. I didn't think I needed to go into the details."

General Sullivan's advance text read:

"In response to the appalling Bosnian Serb behavior over the past week, we have been meeting with our NATO allies to consider the next steps to keep the U.N. protection force in place, because it remains our best insurance against an even worse humanitarian disaster there."

"Although our policy remains that we will not become combatants in the conflict, we are prepared to act with NATO should the need arise."

ACDA IS ESSENTIAL FOR OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as an independent agency and to urge that we consider how important arms control continues to be for our national security. This is also the conclusion of a recent editorial from the News & Observer, from Raleigh, NC. H.R. 1561 would abolish this small federal agency which has proven itself to be an economic bargain. Not only does the operation of the agency come with a modest price tag of under \$50 million, its efforts have saved the Government millions, if not billions, of dollars in defense outlays over its 30-plus years of existence.

I urge a "no" vote on final passage of H.R. 1561. We should not merge ACDA and the other separate foreign service agencies with separate missions into the State Department. The U.S. ACDA is pursuing the biggest and broadest arms control and nonproliferation agenda in history. As the following article makes clear, now is not the time to be dismantling the agency that is charged with getting these agreements negotiated, implemented and verified.

[From the News & Observer, May 30, 1995]

FOREIGN POLICY MEDDLING

A proposal to reorganize foreign affairs agencies has consequences beyond mere streamlining. Some in Congress would like excessive control over foreign policy, a bad idea in today's unstable world.

Overhauling the nation's foreign policy agencies, as proposed by Senator Helms, seems on first glance to make sense. Separate organizations tend to be inefficient, and as long as the rest of government is being "reinvested," foreign affairs shouldn't be exempt.

But a closer look unveils flaws in the proposal, which is advanced in pending legislation in both the Senate and the House.

For one thing, the assorted foreign services agencies don't all have the same mission; merging them into the State Department risks diluting their influence in the sea of a single mighty bureaucracy. In a recent visit to The N&O, John Holum, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, made a strong argument along this line for preserving his office as a separate expert voice.

As Holum pointed out, the agency's advocacy of arms control and nonproliferation is crucial in the face of new threats from the spread of weapons. His worry, and it comes across as legitimate, is that the arms-control quest could become secondary to the State Department's concerns for smooth diplomacy and maintaining good relations with other countries.